

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 2, 2007, the time to respond being until October 2, 2007. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are previously allowed. Claims 2, 4, 9-10 and 12 are previously canceled. Claims 6-8, 11 and 13-18 stand rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-8, 11 and 13-18 are respectfully requested. Claims 6, 8 and 16 are herein amended.

The examiner rejects claim 6 as obvious over Lane *et al.* [US 2004/0181676] in light of Kravitz *et al.* [US 5,978,493]. Lane discloses the recording of an individual's identifying information on an electronic storage medium which a child's guardian may later elect to provide to authorities if the child goes missing. As the examiner observes, Lane does not disclose a plurality of reporting stations or a plurality of registration stations. The examiner combines Lane with Kravitz which, according to the examiner, discloses multiple reporting stations (Kravitz, Column 2 lines 26-29) and multiple reporting registration stations (Kravitz, Column 2 lines 2-15.) The examiner is mistaken as to the multiple reporting stations disclosed in Kravitz. According to Kravitz, images of a lost child stored on the electronic medium may be displayed by authorities on multiple television screens in a facility to aid in locating a missing child (Kravitz, Column 2 lines 26-29.) No provision for reporting a child missing at these television screens is disclosed. A single "reader" station (Column 2 line 19) operated by a facility is disclosed with which authorities may access the stored identifying information.


Likewise, as observed by the examiner, neither Lane nor Kravitz discloses the use of a powerhorn. Further, neither Lane nor Kravitz discloses instantaneous and automatic use of a powerhorn, video display or other public notification system upon reading of a missing child's portable electronic storage medium, as presently recited in amended claim 6. The present

invention was specifically developed for the automatic and instantaneous activation of an audio/visual public address system to enlist the help of the public in the most expedient and effective manner. This recitation is an essential element of the claim and none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests this element or combination such that an obviousness rejection is improper. Claim 6 is, therefore, patently distinguished from the prior art and should be allowed. Claims 7-8, 11 and 13-18 are but additional recitations dependent on claim 6 and should, thus, likewise, be allowed

* * * * *

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in the proper condition, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Royal W. Craig
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,145

Royal W. Craig
Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver
120 East Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21202-1643
Telephone: (410) 685-1120